

DIVERT COURT  
OF DALLAS COUNTY

---

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

BY

DR. THOMAS B. FOMBY AND  
MS. VASUDHA RANGAPRASAD

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS  
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY  
DALLAS, TEXAS 75275

AUGUST 31, 2002

# DIVERT COURT

---

## COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This is a follow-up study of the DIVERT Court recidivism study of August, 2001 written by Ms. Monica Turley and Ms. Ashley Sibley of the Psychology Department of Southern Methodist University in August 2001 entitled "Presentation of Outcome Evaluation Findings DIVERT Advisory Board." Their study examined the recidivism behavior of 178 Divert Court participants and 78 Control Group participants over a twenty-seven month follow-up period. They found a statistically significant reduction in recidivism arising from participation in the DIVERT Court program.
- This study analyzes a cost-benefit ledger based on the event histories of the participants in the Turley/Sibley recidivism study. The ledger is based on 15 months of "treatment" costs for each participant and, after treatment, the savings to society from reduced recidivism arising from DIVERT Court treatment.
- This study finds the Benefit-Cost ratio associated with the DIVERT Court program over a 40 month follow-up period to be **9.43:1**. That is, on average, for every dollar spent on upgrading drug treatment from the Control group (traditional adjudication) to drug treatment through DIVERT Court, \$9.43 of costs can be saved by society over a 40 month post-treatment period. Even though this Benefit-Cost ratio is quite substantial, it is still a conservative estimate of the benefits forthcoming from the DIVERT Court program for reasons detailed in the report.

# COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

## OF DALLAS COUNTY DIVERT COURT

---

### SIGNIFICANCE FOR DRUG COURT PROGRAMS

---

Early drug courts appeared in the U.S. in the 1980s. Rigorous evaluation is being recognized as an integral part of drug court implementation. An area of growing importance is the evaluation of costs and benefits associated with such Diversion programs. This evaluation uses three groups of subjects in the Dallas County, Texas criminal justice system to evaluate the economic impact of program outcomes. Within the climate of fiscal conservatism and competing demand for resources in which most of these programs operate, a cost benefit study can help document the “return on investments” made in a drug court program. Evaluations of the cost-effectiveness of such programs can produce important results and have important policy implications. Such rigorous and continuing research provides local, state and national policymakers important decision-making information. It provides them with a knowledge database for thinking about what works, what does not work, and the role of alternative programs such as the Diversion Programs. As such, our findings contribute to the national database on drug court outcomes; they also serve, along with similar studies, to focus national attention on drug courts such as the one being implemented in Dallas County.

The Dallas Initiative for Diversion and Expedited Rehabilitation and Treatment (DIVERT) Program was started in 1998 and serves Dallas County, Texas. The DIVERT program aims to reduce the adverse impact of repeat drug offenders on the Dallas County criminal justice system. First time non-violent drug addicted offenders who are either charged with a state jail felony level drug possession or obtaining a controlled substance by fraud are eligible to participate in this program. This is a voluntary program and on successful completion, the offender’s case is dismissed. This study examines the potential cost savings to society of pursuing drug treatment through DIVERT Court programs as compared to treatment of drug offenders through traditional adjudication.

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

This is a follow-up study of the Divert Court recidivism study written by Ms. Monica Turley and Ms. Ashley Sibley of the Psychology Department of Southern Methodist University. The results of their study are reported in the paper "Presentation of Outcome Evaluation Findings DIVERT Advisory Board" dated August 23, 2001. In their study recidivism rates and type of arrest were examined and compared for three groups of subjects in the Dallas County, Texas criminal justice system. Group one consisted of seventy-seven subjects who successfully completed the Dallas County DIVERT Court Program. Group two consisted of one hundred and one subjects who participated in the DIVERT Court Program, but were discharged or dropped out before completing the program. Group three consisted of seventy-eight subjects who were matched to the DIVERT graduates on age, gender, and ethnicity, but who went through the typical adjudication process. The participants in all three groups were tracked for up to twenty-seven months.

Summarizing their research findings, Turley and Sibley found that, over a 27 month period, the DIVERT Court graduates had a re-arrest percentage of 15.6% and a mean number of re-arrests of 0.21. Somewhat less satisfactorily, the DIVERT Court dropouts had a re-arrest percentage of 39.5% and a mean number of re-arrests of 0.58. For all DIVERT Court participants, whether dropout or graduate, the re-arrest rate was 27.8%. In comparison, over a twenty-seven month period, the traditional adjudication group, hereafter called the Control group, had a re-arrest percentage of 48.7% and a mean re-arrest rate of 0.86. Thus, as measured by the re-arrest percentage, the recidivism rate of the DIVERT Court graduates was only 32% of that of the Control group. The DIVERT Court dropouts' re-arrest percentage was only 81% of that of the Control group, and for all DIVERT Court participants, whether graduate or dropout, their re-arrest percentage was only 57% of that of the Control group. Quoting Turley and Sibley, "These findings suggest that the DIVERT Court Program is successful in reducing overall post program recidivism and specifically drug related re-arrests for those who graduated from the program. Additionally, overall recidivism

including arrests for drug related charges are lower for those who have dropped out of DIVERT than for the comparison group.”<sup>1</sup>

In contrast to the Turley/Sibley study, the purpose of this study is to “put some dollars and cents” into the comparisons between DIVERT Court and traditional adjudication when it comes to treating drug offenders. Even though the recidivism rates among DIVERT Court participants were less than the recidivism rates of the Control group, does it make economic sense to spend substantially more for drug treatment through the DIVERT Court system when the cost of the traditional adjudication system is much less? Possibly the extra cost to society of treating drug offenders through DIVERT Court does not provide enough benefits to society to warrant the extra expense. Examining the relative costs and benefits of DIVERT Court vis-à-vis traditional adjudication is the major purpose of this study.

---

#### IDENTIFICATION OF EVENT HISTORIES

---

The cost-benefit analysis reported in this study consists of two research activities that enable us to calculate the Benefit-Cost ratio reported here. The first activity consists of calculating the cost of "treatment" of participants whether in the form of jail time, court time, or drug treatment. The second activity consists of detailing the costs incurred by society of additional violations of the law in the follow-up period. The cost-benefit analysis conducted here, compares the costs of treatment across the DIVERT Court and Control Group participants with the savings to society of fewer additional violations perpetrated by the Divert Court participants.

In this section, we discuss the identification of event histories of all participants. In the next section, we explain the derivation of cost factors that are attached to the various events and in the following section we show how the identified events and derived cost factors are used to calculate the Benefit-Cost ratio.

In creating the event histories of the participants in this study we had to track the complete involvement of all of the participants in the criminal justice system from arrest and booking to judgment

---

<sup>1</sup> p. 2, Turley and Sibley, August 23, 2001.

and sentencing, and examining re-arrest records of the participants in the follow-up period. The event histories of all the participants in all three groups (Control group, DIVERT Court graduates, and DIVERT Court non-graduates) were recorded as accurately as possible from the time of arrest until August 31, 2002. Principal sources of data included printed computer screens (JI55 and CAS screens) and information provided by the Communities Supervision Corrections Department (CSCD). The information derived from these sources was incorporated with cost factor data in a spreadsheet to determine an estimated cost for each case.

A standard arrest process was assumed for all sample cases. This process includes investigation, arrest, interrogation and booking. We assumed that events such as prosecutorial review, defense attorney interviews, and case processing and arraignment in county court occurred for all the participants in the study. The CADISP and CACORT screens contain basic information about each case and brief descriptions of the court events associated with each case. Judgment and sentencing information for the initial arrest pertaining to the study, as well as future arrests, were obtained from the JI55 screens. Each judgment and sentencing event was tallied as a single event, although sentencing might include any number of court-ordered requirements and conditions (e.g., probation, confinement, treatment and incarceration). Information about treatment participation and testing were obtained from the CANARR and CASRAT (narratives and referral agency information) screens.

We used the information on the CAS (County Access System) screens to calculate the number of days on probation. The days on probation were calculated as the difference between the probation start and end dates. The start date was defined as the day of sentencing while the end date was defined as the earliest of three possible dates: (1) the actual end date of the probation as shown in the CAS screens; (2) the scheduled end date of probation date as shown by the original court sentence; (3) August 31, 2002. Jail and prison records were used to determine whether the offender was sentenced to serve jail/prison time, the length of the sentence in days, the number of days confirmed (by the JI55 screens) to have been served, and the number of days projected to be served. The number of days served and assumed to have been served includes all times served at state and county facilities after the date of the presenting arrest; for the offenders currently serving jail/prison time, August 31, 2002 is the last day counted for this event. The

number of days projected to be served by participants after August 31, 2002 were not included in the event histories of the participants.

Diversion program and treatment participation was recorded as the number of months the offender participated in the diversion program. The information was obtained from the screens maintained by the program manager of the diversion program. The screens contained detailed information about the participants: date of entry, discharge date, number of court appearances, number of urine analyses (UAs), the treatment plan, the treatment facilities the participants went to, the number of days of treatment and so on. Similar information for the Divert Court non-graduates was obtained and the reasons for discharge, the type and the date were recorded.

We derived cost factors for each of the major events listed above by gathering data from various agencies. In Appendix A of this report we show all of our cost factors used in our analysis. We also list our key sources of information that were critical to the completion of the cost benefit analysis.

---

**ESTIMATED COSTS OF TREATMENT OF DIVERT COURT PARTICIPANTS VERSUS  
CONTROL GROUP PARTICIPANTS**

---

In conducting this cost-benefit study we considered the costs of drug treatment in DIVERT Court versus the costs of “treatment,” be they drug treatment or incarceration, among the Control group participants. We also considered the benefits to society that come from the reduced re-arrest rate that results from DIVERT Court participation.

---

**DIVERT COURT TREATMENT COSTS**

---

The various costs associated with DIVERT Court drug treatment fall into one of the following six categories:

- 1) Pre-trial processing costs
- 2) Evaluation and Screening costs
- 3) Administrative costs
- 4) Treatment costs
- 5) Urine analysis testing costs
- 6) Miscellaneous costs.

- 1) **Pre-trial processing costs:** Consideration for admission to DIVERT Court is limited to those offenders who meet the eligibility criteria adopted by the Dallas County Commissioner's court for pre-trial release, including participants bonded from jail prior to pre-trial interviews and individuals bonded from surrounding counties who commit crimes in Dallas county.
- 2) **Evaluation and Screening Costs:** If the participants meet the eligibility requirements for pre-trial and DIVERT Court, then they will report to the Treatment Alternatives to Incarceration Program- Comprehensive Assessment and Treatment Services (TAIP-CATS). The CATS staff evaluates offenders, determines the appropriate level of treatment, and makes the necessary recommendations for follow-up. Currently screening and assessment are in-kind contributions of a grant serving DIVERT Court.
- 3) **Administrative costs** include court costs and salaries of personnel. The judge's time was donated. The Grant pays the program manager's salary. Also the Assistant District Attorney's and the Public Defender's salary is paid by the grant. The Public Defender's salary has been an in-kind contribution since June 2000. There are two bailiffs and one security officer and the Grant pays their salaries. There are four case managers and their salaries and fringe benefits are an in-kind contribution from Communities Supervision Corrections Department (CSCD). All the Divert Court participants are required to appear in Court on a regular basis.
- 4) **Treatment Costs:**
  - Out-patient Treatment: Group and Individual Counseling
  - Inpatient treatment
  - Substance educational and vocational classes
- 5) **Urine Analysis costs:** The participants are tested through out the duration of their treatment. The participants are required to pay for their positive UA's and also have to pay for their confirmation UA's.
- 6) **Miscellaneous Costs:** Includes travel related costs, some fixed costs.

In the subsequent cost-benefit analysis we separately account for in-kind contributions in the above categories, first assuming that all in-kind costs will eventually be borne by the program for a more conservative calculation of the benefit-cost ratio and then, later, assuming the grant continues in perpetuity for a more liberal calculation of the benefit-cost ratio. (See p. 13, footnote 3)

---

### **CONTROL COURT TREATMENT COSTS**

---

Apart from the costs of pre-screening, the costs of the Control group fall into the same categories as the DIVERT Court treatment costs:

- 1) Evaluation and Screening costs
- 2) Urinalysis Testing costs
- 3) Probation Costs
- 4) Treatment Costs
- 5) Costs of Incarceration.

In contrast to the DIVERT Court program, however, the Control group costs do not benefit from in-kind contributions of time, et cetera.

---

### **METHODOLOGY**

---

To review, the data set used in this study consists of the three groups defined by the recidivism study of Ms. Turley and Ms. Sibley. The three groups consisted of 77 DIVERT Court graduates, 101 DIVERT non-graduates and 70 Control group participants.<sup>2</sup>

To execute this cost-benefit study, we need to examine the event histories of 70 participants in the Control group and 178 participants in DIVERT Court over the period February 1998 through August 2002.

The economic details of these event histories allow us to determine the Benefit-Cost ratio of moving a participant from traditional adjudication (the Control group) to Divert Court for drug treatment

---

<sup>2</sup> Eight people from the Control group dropped out. Some of the cases were dismissed and some were transferred to other counties or states.

purposes. The following assumptions were used in constructing the cost-benefit ledgers of the participants in this study:

- The average time of treatment among the DIVERT Court participants (both graduate and dropout) in our sample was 15 months.
- Control group participants who went through traditional adjudication were given “equal time” by counting all costs for the first 15 months, whether incarceration, probation, or actual drug treatment, as the costs of treatment for the Control group.
- After 15 months, all events, whether they be associated with DIVERT Court participants or Control group participants such as re-arrests, court appearances, more probation, further incarcerations, more drug treatment and the like were counted as “avoidable” costs to society which, if eliminated through DIVERT Court treatment, would be a benefit to society.
- If a DIVERT Court dropout came back into the criminal justice system after initial treatment, costs incurred through the 15<sup>th</sup> month were treated as “treatment” costs whereas costs incurred beyond 15 months were treated as “avoidable” costs to society. After the DIVERT Court graduates graduated, any costs incurred afterward were treated as “avoidable” costs to society and were added to the graduate’s cost-benefit ledger.

Given these assumptions, we created a cost-benefit ledger for all of the participants based upon at least 15 months of "treatment" and, after treatment, we calculated "avoidable" costs due to recidivism. The logic of the cost-benefit analysis we conduct here is then based upon comparing the costs of treatment for the various groups with the “avoidable” costs incurred after treatment. If the increased cost of treatment vis-à-vis DIVERT Court is more than offset by the reduction in “avoidable” costs offered from successful drug treatment (hereafter referred to as "savings to society"), DIVERT Court would then meet the test of a beneficial program.

---

## CALCULATION OF COSTS AND BENEFITS

---

Now let us turn to the presentation of our calculations of the costs and benefits of the DIVERT Court program. First, consider Table 1 titled “Comparison of Treatment Costs and Avoidable Costs for Control Group Participants versus Divert Court Participants” presented in Appendix B of this report. For each participant group, the table is made up of four columns. These columns are labeled “Cost of Treatment,” “Total Avoidable Costs,” “Months Since Treatment,” and “Avoidable Costs Per Month.” Cost of Treatment and Avoidable Costs have been described above. We decided to follow the event histories of the participants from the time of their initial entrance to their programs to the latest available date, August 31, 2002. As the Control group program pre-dates the DIVERT Court program, the number of months since the treatment period ended is generally greater for the Control group than for the DIVERT Court group. See column 3 of Table 1 for the number of months since the participant’s “treatment” period ended. Thus, for comparison purposes, we calculate a fourth column for each group labeled “Avoidable Costs Per Month.” For each group (and the combined DIVERT Court group) we also calculate the average cost of treatment and the average avoidable costs per month per participant. These averages, in turn, will be used to calculate the Benefit-Cost ratio reported in the next section of this report.

---

## CALCULATION OF BENEFIT-COST RATIO

---

In this section we calculate the Benefit-Cost ratio of the DIVERT Court program as represented by the participants of the three groups examined here. This calculation is quite straightforward. The Benefit-Cost ratio is calculated in four steps.

- 1) First, the increase in average cost of treatment in going from the Control group to the DIVERT Court group is calculated as the difference between the **average** cost of treatment for **all** DIVERT Court participants (\$4593.29) and the **average** cost of “treatment” for the Control group participants (\$3026.91). This number is  $4593.29 - 3026.91 = 1566.38$ . That is, on average, the increase in the cost of treatment in going from Control group “treatment” to DIVERT Court treatment is \$1566.38

- 2) Second, the average savings to society (of avoidable costs) per month by being in the DIVERT Court program rather than being in the Control group is calculated as the difference between the average avoidable costs per month for the Control group (\$455.24) and the average avoidable costs per month for the entire DIVERT court group (\$85.96). This number is  $\$455.24 - \$85.96 = \$369.28$ .
- 3) Third, we note that the average length of time since the participants of this sub-sample study received their “treatments” is 40 months (as of August 2002). Thus, taking 40 months as the follow-up period for this study, we see that the average savings of avoidable costs to society of a participant going from the Control group to the DIVERT Court group is  $40 \times \$369.28 = \$14,771.20$ .
- 4) Finally, the Benefit-Cost ratio is calculated as  $\$14,771.20/\$1,566.38 = \mathbf{9.43:1}$ . That is, on average, for every dollar spent on upgrading drug treatment from the Control group (traditional adjudication) to drug treatment through DIVERT Court, \$9.43 of avoidable costs is saved by society over a 40 month period.

---

## CONCLUSIONS

---

- The average cost of the initial drug treatment of the participants in the Control group was \$3026.91 whereas, in the follow-up period, the average monthly costs to society of unsuccessful drug treatment was \$455.24.
- The average cost of the initial drug treatment of all of the participants in DIVERT Court (whether graduates or not) was \$4593.29 whereas, in the follow-up period, the average monthly costs to society of unsuccessful drug treatment was \$85.96.
- Over a 40-month follow-up period, the average savings to society arising from choosing to treat an individual through DIVERT Court rather than traditional adjudication is \$14,771.20. (40 months is the average length of time from the date the participants of this sample completed their initial treatments until August 2002.)
- The \$14,771.20 in savings to society offered by DIVERT Court treatment is obtained by expending \$1566.38 more in treatment costs than in traditional adjudication. Therefore, the Benefit-Cost ratio of this present study is **9.43:1**. That is, on average, every additional dollar spent on drug treatment in Divert Court results in a reduction of \$9.43 in costs to society over a 40-month period.
- If the trends reported here persisted among the participants of this study for 20 years after treatment, the Benefit-Cost ratio would be 56.58:1. ( $\$369.28 \times 240 = \$88,627.20$  and, therefore,  $\$88,627.20/\$1,566.38 = 56.58:1$  would be the Cost-Benefit ratio.)

- The Benefit-Cost ratios calculated here are conservative. Not all of the costs to society due to recidivism were included in this study. Data is not available for the calculation of the loss of property or the costs of personal injury that sometimes arise from crimes associated with additional arrests. Moreover no data was available on the social costs associated with chronic drug problems such as children addicted at childbirth, spousal and family abuse, loss of worker efficiency, and the like. Inclusion of these additional costs would almost certainly increase the Benefit-Cost ratios calculated here because the DIVERT Court group exhibited substantially less drug problems after rehabilitation than the Control group participants. On top of these considerations, it should be noted that the screening criteria used to admit candidates to the DIVERT Court program is biased toward admitting candidates who have substantial drug problems whereas many of the Control group participants had less than substantial drug problems. On average then, due to this "selectivity bias", one might suspect that the DIVERT Court participants were more severely dependent on drugs at the beginning of their drug treatment than their counterparts in the Control group. Therefore, other things held constant, one might expect the DIVERT participants more likely to commit drug-related offenses in the follow-up period than their Control group counterparts.
- Some items that we included in DIVERT Court costs were actually volunteer services and payments made by private individuals and insurance companies. If these volunteer services and payments by private individuals and insurance companies are sustained in future, these items could be removed from costs of treatment in DIVERT Court. If such is done, the average cost of drug treatment in DIVERT Court would be lower than calculated here and the Benefit-Cost ratio would be higher than the number reported here.<sup>3</sup>

It might be noted that the Benefit-Cost ratios calculated here are consistent with another cost-benefit study recently conducted in California. In the 1994 study “Evaluating Recovery Services: The California Drug and Alcohol Treatment Assessment (CALDATA)” it was found that “The cost of treating approximately 150,000 participants represented by the CALDATA study sample in 1992 was \$209 million, while the benefits received during treatment and in the first year afterwards were worth approximately 1.5 billion in savings to taxpaying citizens, due mostly to reductions in crime.”<sup>4</sup> Thus, the CALDATA study indicates a 7.18:1 Benefit-Cost ratio for a one-year follow-up period. Had their follow-up period been 40 months like ours, their Benefit-Cost ratio would have been larger and may have more closely approximated our Benefit-Cost ratio. On the other hand, their study benefited from extensive follow-up services employed by the State of California whereby the costs of crimes committed could be calculated. In this

---

<sup>3</sup> The implicit costs of Judge Creuzot’s volunteer time and the costs of drug treatment covered by the Corrections Supervision Department, private insurance, individual contributions, and government grants were included in the calculation of costs of treatment in the Divert Court. If these implicit costs were dropped from the calculation, the average cost of treatment for Divert Court graduates would become \$4580.34 (instead of \$5451.90) while the average cost of treatment for Divert Court non-graduates would become \$3158.99 (instead of \$3938.71). Likewise, the average cost of treatment for all Divert Court participants would become \$3759.12 (instead of \$4593.29). Then, allowing for volunteer time and other contributions, the differences in cost of treatment become \$3,759.12 - \$3026.91 = \$732.21 and the Benefit-Cost ratio would become \$14771.20: \$732.21 = **20.17:1**.

<sup>4</sup> Executive Summary of “Evaluating Recovery Services: The California Drug and Alcohol Treatment Assessment (CALDATA),” 1994, page 3.

study we did not have data available on the costs of crimes committed by participants, otherwise our Benefit-Cost ratio would have been larger.

Our findings constitute evidence that the DIVERT program being implemented in Dallas County, Texas is successful from a cost-effectiveness point of view when compared to traditional adjudication and sentencing. Future research, with longer follow-up periods and the calculation of additional societal costs through extensive follow-up surveys may show even more favorable results. Therefore, in general, the evidence presented here adds to the literature previously published elsewhere that indicates that drug court diversion constitutes a viable criminal justice alternative for many drug offenders.

---

## REFERENCES

---

- “Limes to Limes: Comparing the Operational Costs of Juvenile and Adult Correctional Programs in Texas,” January 2001
- "Presentation of Outcome Evaluation Findings DIVERT Advisory Board" August 23, 2001, Ashley and Sibley
- “Oranges to Oranges: Comparing the Operational Costs of Juvenile and Adult Correctional Programs in Texas,” January 1999
- “The Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Program: Evaluation and Recommendations,” Chapter VI. Cost Effectiveness of SAFP Program
- Prosecution and Sentencing Costs obtained from Dallas County Budget Office
- <http://www.tjci.state.tx.us/statistics/stats-stjailavgcostprday.htm>
- The State Jail System Today: An Update, March 2000
- CALDATA Study: The California Drug and Alcohol Treatment Assessment 1994
- “Phase II Douglas County Drug Court Evaluation: Final Report, The District Court of Nebraska,” June 1999
- Bureau of Labor Statistics: <http://www.bls.gov>
- U.S. Department of Commerce: Consumer Price Index: <http://www.doc.gov>
- “Criminal Justice Policy Council Biennial Report to the Governor and the 77th Texas Legislature,” January 2001
- “Criminal Justice Policy Council Biennial Report to the Governor and the 76th Legislature: The Big Picture in Juvenile and Adult Criminal Justice,” January 1999



4. The cost per day for offenders supervised by community supervision corrections departments (probation) was \$2.05 per day.
  5. Cost for supervising parolees was \$2.85 per day.
  6. SAFPF: \$46.50/day
  7. TTC: A Transitional Treatment Center (Salvation Army) where SAFFP offenders reside for approximately 3 months after completing the initial 9- to 12-months in the secure SAFFP facility
    - TTC - \$30 per day
    - OP Group Counseling - \$11 per hour
    - OP Individual Counseling - \$32 per hour
  8. SATF (Cornell Corrections or commonly known as Wilmer)
    - Level II - Intensive Residential - \$55.40 per day
    - Level III - Residential - \$32.00 per day
  9. Loss of Income:
    - Minimum wage: \$5.15/hour
    - They worked 8 hours a day and 20 days a month and earned minimum wage
  10. Estimates of loss to property were not available
- All figures reported here are in 1998 dollars. The consumer price index produced by the U.S. Department of Commerce was used to convert expenditures in the various years to the 2001 level.

APPENDIX B

**TABLE 1<sup>5</sup>**  
**Comparison of Treatment Costs and Avoidable Costs**  
**of Control Group Participants versus Divert Court Participants**

CONTROL GROUP PARTICIPANTS

Costs of Treatment	Total Avoidable Costs	Months Since Treatment	Avoidable Costs/Month
1281.41	71372.75	42.00	1699.35
1178.78	571.77	32.00	17.87
1098.44	952.94	40.00	23.82
12095.60	0.00	46.00	0.00
1956.07	1334.12	45.00	29.65
997.94	1334.12	43.00	31.03
5645.44	12994.06	37.00	351.19
5605.30	36044.02	50.00	720.88
1025.44	14212.38	45.00	315.83
1025.44	2858.83	41.00	69.73
1009.44	952.94	33.00	28.88
12349.72	0.00	40.00	0.00
1019.94	1334.12	45.00	29.65
1030.94	1334.12	46.00	29.00
1025.44	3576.51	48.00	74.51
2913.70	59523.64	49.00	1214.77
2446.77	6004.69	36.00	166.80
1025.44	7550.95	36.00	209.75
13050.98	140100.96	25.00	5604.04
453.68	0.00	25.00	0.00
1025.44	74360.08	40.00	1859.00
1615.71	2833.12	36.00	78.70
2170.99	4497.00	41.00	109.68
1019.94	43337.82	41.00	1057.02
13207.94	65835.72	36.00	1828.77
1355.44	14879.96	44.00	338.18
1025.44	2858.83	40.00	71.47
1172.94	9301.04	41.00	226.85
3005.44	1334.12	44.00	30.32
1025.44	1334.12	42.00	31.76
5684.10	9089.29	48.00	189.36
1041.94	81485.10	38.00	2144.34
11169.48	65238.67	44.00	1482.70
952.94	19515.71	41.00	475.99
980.44	1334.12	39.00	34.21

<sup>5</sup> To make all of our calculations time-consistent, the consumer price index produced by the U.S. Department of Commerce was used to convert expenditures in the various years to the 2001 level.

**TABLE 1<sup>6</sup> (Continued)**

**CONTROL GROUP PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Costs of Treatment</b>	<b>Total Avoidable Costs</b>	<b>Months Since Treatment</b>	<b>Avoidable Costs/Month</b>
1030.94	33070.43	48.00	688.97
1052.94	2858.53	38.00	75.22
1755.94	9162.15	46.00	199.18
952.94	1334.12	40.00	33.35
1019.94	2858.83	39.00	73.30
2350.94	11353.67	49.00	231.71
997.94	27786.07	45.00	617.47
952.94	0.00	40.00	0.00
7470.82	17413.20	39.00	446.49
4962.58	79719.19	35.00	2277.69
1025.44	1334.12	53.00	25.17
980.44	16876.52	30.00	562.55
969.44	2833.12	35.00	80.95
6638.82	42816.20	39.00	1097.85
5400.66	58905.80	47.00	1253.31
1121.44	5359.72	41.00	130.72
1025.44	6011.80	41.00	146.63
7661.82	10589.80	38.00	278.68
1025.44	4951.83	42.00	117.90
1245.55	2858.83	45.00	63.53
7463.96	4982.10	36.00	138.39
2941.26	17184.79	40.00	429.62
1041.94	11108.83	40.00	277.72
2820.44	5856.83	45.00	130.15
6473.20	4497.00	38.00	118.34
952.94	1334.12	43.00	31.03
952.94	2858.83	37.00	77.27
1362.33	2129.47	33.00	64.53
2226.47	56029.74	44.00	1273.40
11262.37	35309.72	39.00	905.38
952.94	11311.31	44.00	257.08
1074.94	24083.15	41.00	587.39
1025.44	20176.11	39.00	517.34
5975.44	952.94	38.00	25.08
1025.44	1334.12	42.00	31.76
211883.99	1296530.61	2848.00	TOTAL
3026.91	455.24	40.69	AVERAGE

Average Cost of  
Treatment for Control  
Group Participants = \$ 3026.91

Average Avoidable Costs Per  
Month for Control  
Participants = \$455.24

<sup>6</sup> To make all of our calculations time-consistent, the consumer price index produced by the U.S. Department of Commerce to convert expenditures in the various years to the 2001 level.

**Table 1 (Continued)****DIVERT COURT GRADUATES**

<b>Costs of Treatment</b>	<b>Total Avoidable Costs</b>	<b>Months Since Treatment</b>	<b>Avoidable Costs/Month</b>
4877.80	0.00	28.00	0.00
3544.80	0.00	37.00	0.00
8443.80	0.00	32.00	0.00
8512.30	0.00	39.00	0.00
3521.55	0.00	42.00	0.00
4203.80	2271.94	33.00	68.85
4227.30	0.00	30.00	0.00
4996.05	0.00	36.00	0.00
4542.30	0.00	30.00	0.00
4283.80	3431.36	32.00	107.23
5075.55	0.00	36.00	0.00
3685.55	0.00	30.00	0.00
4548.05	0.00	36.00	0.00
3958.55	0.00	29.00	0.00
7795.92	0.00	42.00	0.00
4165.30	0.00	41.00	0.00
4536.30	0.00	39.00	0.00
4134.30	0.00	32.00	0.00
4188.80	0.00	33.00	0.00
4717.30	0.00	40.00	0.00
5634.05	0.00	37.00	0.00
4449.05	0.00	29.00	0.00
4471.30	2271.94	39.00	58.25
4822.30	1499.00	36.00	41.64
4968.30	0.00	36.00	0.00
8332.30	21413.86	36.00	594.83
4580.05	0.00	30.00	0.00
4275.05	0.00	38.00	0.00
4433.55	0.00	28.00	0.00
5454.05	0.00	34.00	0.00
4072.30	0.00	42.00	0.00
4276.55	0.00	41.00	0.00
4740.55	1499.00	38.00	39.45
4845.80	0.00	36.00	0.00
4568.80	2271.94	33.00	68.85
4163.30	0.00	42.00	0.00
15005.55	0.00	39.00	0.00
3874.80	0.00	36.00	0.00
3880.80	0.00	38.00	0.00
5114.05	0.00	34.00	0.00
4757.30	0.00	34.00	0.00
4600.80	0.00	33.00	0.00
4489.05	0.00	33.00	0.00
3847.80	0.00	28.00	0.00

**Table 1 (Continued)**

**DIVERT COURT GRADUATES**

<b>Costs of Treatment</b>	<b>Total Avoidable Costs</b>	<b>Months Since Treatment</b>	<b>Avoidable Costs/Month</b>
18007.55	0.00	35.00	0.00
3932.55	0.00	41.00	0.00
3876.05	0.00	42.00	0.00
4322.30	0.00	28.00	0.00
9209.80	6223.41	28.00	222.26
8956.80	0.00	28.00	0.00
4290.30	0.00	35.00	0.00
3778.05	0.00	41.00	0.00
4014.80	0.00	42.00	0.00
4169.55	0.00	36.00	0.00
4061.30	0.00	42.00	0.00
4878.30	0.00	28.00	0.00
4148.05	0.00	32.00	0.00
4307.30	2998.00	29.00	103.38
4229.30	0.00	40.00	0.00
11152.30	0.00	32.00	0.00
3827.55	0.00	42.00	0.00
4044.80	0.00	41.00	0.00
4068.30	5291.94	35.00	151.20
3610.30	0.00	41.00	0.00
5156.05	0.00	34.00	0.00
3834.30	0.00	38.00	0.00
4306.80	0.00	41.00	0.00
3803.55	3044.88	40.00	76.12
4626.30	0.00	29.00	0.00
4019.30	0.00	40.00	0.00
8293.30	0.00	37.00	0.00
9359.05	0.00	38.00	0.00
6507.30	0.00	37.00	0.00
6156.55	0.00	34.00	0.00
3801.80	0.00	42.00	0.00
21985.80	5363.71	33.00	162.54
3444.80	0.00	34.00	0.00
419796.65	57581.00	2708.00	TOTAL
5451.90	21.26	35.17	AVERAGE

Average Cost of Treatment for Divert Court Graduates = \$5451.90

Average Avoidable Cost Per Month for Divert Court Graduates = \$21.26

**Table 1 (Continued)****DIVERT COURT NON-GRADUATES**

<b>Costs of Treatment</b>	<b>Total Avoidable Costs</b>	<b>Months Since Treatment</b>	<b>Avoidable Costs/Month</b>
10869.87	0.00	37.00	0.00
1605.31	0.00	35.00	0.00
2925.65	0.00	51.00	0.00
954.82	6661.80	31.00	214.90
1597.85	27762.84	53.00	523.83
1393.28	0.00	49.00	0.00
406.98	0.00	33.00	0.00
2277.86	0.00	38.00	0.00
1763.53	0.00	51.00	0.00
2783.21	0.00	42.00	0.00
2310.28	0.00	39.00	0.00
1655.13	1499.00	29.00	51.69
6571.08	57928.55	53.00	1092.99
6464.19	0.00	41.00	0.00
7336.62	0.00	40.00	0.00
7297.75	0.00	38.00	0.00
6198.70	0.00	38.00	0.00
8475.34	10712.10	28.00	382.58
7977.15	0.00	34.00	0.00
2109.71	0.00	47.00	0.00
4388.36	0.00	43.00	0.00
2136.04	0.00	47.00	0.00
2514.50	0.00	34.00	0.00
2252.24	0.00	42.00	0.00
3422.26	0.00	41.00	0.00
1466.96	0.00	50.00	0.00
6535.57	0.00	46.00	0.00
3397.41	14879.96	52.00	286.15
2069.15	0.00	37.00	0.00
1114.96	0.00	43.00	0.00
3697.85	0.00	41.00	0.00
1068.00	0.00	45.00	0.00
1139.32	0.00	39.00	0.00
1129.59	0.00	45.00	0.00
1206.67	0.00	36.00	0.00
1669.68	0.00	46.00	0.00
4815.20	0.00	28.00	0.00
2417.23	0.00	51.00	0.00
2158.14	0.00	38.00	0.00
1387.53	0.00	52.00	0.00
1320.78	4365.65	44.00	99.22
7792.05	92677.78	53.00	1748.64

**Table 1 (Continued)****DIVERT COURT NON-GRADUATES**

<b>Costs of Treatment</b>	<b>Total Avoidable Costs</b>	<b>Months Since Treatment</b>	<b>Avoidable Costs/Month</b>
3376.27	0.00	37.00	0.00
1335.38	0.00	44.00	0.00
5565.73	6990.21	38.00	183.95
2553.55	52724.56	43.00	1226.15
1452.85	0.00	46.00	0.00
3934.80	0.00	47.00	0.00
5832.76	11376.89	43.00	264.58
3994.60	0.00	28.00	0.00
1225.60	12407.96	46.00	269.74
7186.15	0.00	39.00	0.00
1146.61	3763.26	34.00	110.68
6949.71	10270.64	53.00	193.79
7385.76	0.00	53.00	0.00
2622.74	0.00	31.00	0.00
3398.91	6440.04	39.00	165.13
2559.81	0.00	32.00	0.00
591.51	0.00	46.00	0.00
56.00	0.00	51.00	0.00
3128.44	0.00	41.00	0.00
4517.78	0.00	37.00	0.00
2736.32	0.00	37.00	0.00
4658.11	10981.31	41.00	267.84
5872.39	0.00	38.00	0.00
3928.15	0.00	28.00	0.00
213.47	0.00	43.00	0.00
8881.73	2493.16	33.00	75.55
1824.65	0.00	31.00	0.00
4872.70	19210.17	34.00	565.01
1561.35	6042.88	51.00	118.49
3749.58	0.00	39.00	0.00
6852.52	0.00	45.00	0.00
2499.27	0.00	42.00	0.00
6077.83	0.00	31.00	0.00
13362.58	0.00	39.00	0.00
4281.56	0.00	33.00	0.00
4945.97	0.00	39.00	0.00
10579.80	12770.61	30.00	425.69
6773.40	0.00	44.00	0.00
1477.27	1499.00	43.00	34.86
5006.29	26915.99	48.00	560.75
11083.78	0.00	38.00	0.00
9346.82	17642.93	29.00	608.38
1566.97	15866.77	48.00	330.56

**Table 1 (Continued)**

---

**DIVERT COURT NON-GRADUATES**

---

<b>Costs of Treatment</b>	<b>Total Avoidable Costs</b>	<b>Months Since Treatment</b>	<b>Avoidable Costs/Month</b>
4066.56	0.00	32.00	0.00
1949.68	0.00	43.00	0.00
1483.64	25754.54	50.00	515.09
8141.33	2998.00	47.00	63.79
7348.68	0.00	31.00	0.00
4015.66	0.00	38.00	0.00
2106.96	0.00	36.00	0.00
337.03	0.00	53.00	0.00
9591.26	0.00	36.00	0.00
9825.27	51928.76	38.00	1366.55
2440.63	0.00	44.00	0.00
3171.60	14419.01	48.00	300.40
310.87	0.00	29.00	0.00
8878.26	0.00	29.00	0.00
830.84	0.00	46.00	0.00
270.12	0.00	44.00	0.00
397809.71	528984.37	4116.00	TOTAL
3938.71	129.91	40.75	AVERAGE

Average Cost of Treatment for Divert Court Non-Graduates = \$3938.71

Average Avoidable Cost Per Month for Divert Court Non-Graduates = \$129.91

---

**ALL-DIVERT COURT SUMMARY**

---

Average Cost of Treatment for All Divert Court Participants = \$ 4593.29

Average Avoidable Cost Per Month for All Divert Court Participants = \$85.96